



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,255	04/24/2001	Ramarathnam Venkatesan	MS1-647US	7357
22801	7590	06/22/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			BALI, VIKKRAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/843,255

Applicant(s)

VENKATESAN ET AL.

Examiner

Vikram Bali

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 15-19, 64, 65 and 67-71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 15-19, 64, 65 and 67-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

In response to the amendment filled on 12/30/2004, all the amendment to the claims have been entered and the action follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7, 15-19, 64-65 and 67-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li (U.S. 5,774,588) in view of Karaev et al (US 5802518).

Regarding Claim 1, Li discloses a computer-implemented method for hashing a body of text, the method comprising:

obtaining a body of text (Figure 1A, Step 100; Figure 1B, Step 120; Column 6, Lines 40-50) containing textual content in a computer readable format (see figure 6, the textual content format is taken or stored in to the processor i.e. computer);

deriving a hash value representative of content of the body of text, perceptually distinct bodies of text having hash values that are substantially independent of each other (Figures 2, 4A-B and 5; Column 7, Lines 17-67, Column 8, Lines 1-14. Non-duplicative groups of the signature vector 25 have been hashed to the bucket address table.). However, he fails to disclose formatting the body of test into a defined image based format wherein, the test is immutable via software tools for manipulation of the textual content, as claimed. Karaev teaches information delivery system where the

textual data is converted in to the PDF format in order to store or delivery the data (see col. 3, lines 28-30 and lines 33-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to simply use the teaching of the Karaev of converting the data in to the PDF format in order to safer guard the data, in to the Li's system.

Regarding Claim 2, Li further discloses a method as recited in Claim 1, wherein perceptually distinct bodies of text have hash values that are independent of each other (Figures 4A-B; Column 7, Lines 63-67, Column 8, Lines 1-14).

Regarding Claim 3, Li further discloses a method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising comparing hash values of two bodies of text to determine if such values match (Figure 4B; Column 7, Lines 17-40).

Regarding Claim 4, Li further discloses a method as recited in Claim 1 further comprising comparing hash values of two bodies of text to determine if such values substantially match (Column 6, Lines 28-36; Figure 4B; Column 7, Lines 17-40).

Regarding Claim 5, Li further discloses a method as recited in Claim 4 further comprising indicating whether such values substantially match (Column 6, Lines 28-36; Column 13, Lines 65-67, Column 14, Lines 1-14).

With regards to Claims 6, 7 and 64, arguments analogous to those presented for Claim 1 are applicable to Claims 6, 7 and 64.

With regards to Claims 15-17, arguments analogous to those presented for Claims 1-5 are applicable to Claims 15-17. Li further discloses similar bodies of text having proximally similar hash values (Figures 4A-B; Column 7, Lines 50-67, Column 8,

Lines 1-14. Similar bodies of text (e.g., AH and AI) have proximally similar hash values (proximal 12-bit hash values.).

With regards to Claims 18, 19 and 65, arguments analogous to those presented for Claims 15-17 are applicable to Claims 18, 19 and 65.

With regards to claim 67, Li further teaches comparing the text strings in order to find the perfect match and this match does generates a short list of candidates that have a high likelihood of accurate match i.e. suspicion of plagiarism between the two bodies of the text as claimed.

With regards to the claims 68 and 70, Karaev further teaches the test comprises multiple words and sentences, (see col. 3, lines 28-30) as claimed.

With respect to claim 69 and 71 Karaev teaches the test comprises multiple words a sentences, (see col. 3, lines 28-30), and Li teaches hash is representative of all the textual content (see figure 4A and 4B) as claimed.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2623


shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vakros Bali whose telephone number is 571.272.7415. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM - 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au can be reached on 571.272.7414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vikkram Bali
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2623



vb
June 20, 2005